

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

THOMAS ELGAS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICHARD STRAUB,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:15-cv-0433-GMN-CWH

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman, (ECF No. 3), which states that this case should be dismissed without prejudice.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).


Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

Accordingly,

1 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 3), is
2 **ADOPTED** in full.

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. The
4 Clerk is instructed to enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

5 **DATED** this 24th day of September, 2015.

6
7
8 
9 _____
10 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
11 United States District Court
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25